

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/015,319	THIELMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James Mackey	1722	

All Participants:

(1) James Mackey.

(2) Cynthia Murphy.

Status of Application: Amended

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 11 January 2005

Time: 3:10PM EST

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

49, 71, 79, 81

Prior art documents discussed:

none


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:
Authorization was given to amend claims 49, 71 and 79, as per the Examiner's Amendment, in order to more clearly recite the invention. Authorization was given to change the dependence of claim 81 to depend from claim 76 (instead of claim 80), since claim 82 (dependent from claim 81) requires that the first overlay is attached to the upper belt, which is contrary to claim 80..